

REMARKS

This AMENDMENT UNDER 37 CFR 1.116 is filed in reply to the FINAL REJECTION of April 15, 2005, and is being submitted for clarification purposes and to at least place the application in better form for appeal.

Claims 1-3, 7, and 9-12 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement.

Applicants hereby amend claim 1 to clarify the recitation of the elements comprising the novel fuse structure of the invention. Respectfully, full support for the claim amendment is found in the originally-filed application at, for example, page 7, paragraph [0038]. No new matter has been added. As a preliminary matter, Claim 1 is being amended to ensure that the limitation "which is smaller than the width of other integrated circuit elements on said substrate" is deleted as it had been removed in applicants prior response and amendment dated May 27, 2004.

Claims 7 and 9 have been canceled and the subject matter thereof incorporated in amended Claim 1.

Rejection of Claims 1-3, 7, and 10-12 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph

With respect to the rejection of Claim 1, the Office Action indicates that the claim contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventors, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

In response, Claim 1 is being amended to particularly point out what Applicants regard as the invention. Specifically, claim 1 has been amended to clarify the novel fuse structure which comprises a conductive line (element 12, Fig. 7) formed on the substrate and

having two end portions for connecting two adjacent photolithography produced features (elements 101, 102, Fig. 7) on the semiconductor substrate that receive the respective first and second power supply voltages. The conductive line further having a center portion with the two end portions and said center portion having a minimum design width (W1), and the conductive line further having a link portion (element 13, Fig. 7) formed approximately at the center of the center portion and spaced from the end portions which has a sub-minimum width (W2) less than said minimum design width, wherein the center portion is spaced from the two end portions by a spacing equal to at least twice the minimum design width.

Respectfully, the limitation that the link portion is formed approximately at the center of the center portion is found from canceled Claim 9. Further, the limitation that the center portion is spaced from the two end portions by a spacing equal to at least twice the minimum design width is clearly supported by the specification where it is described how, in one

embodiment, using current photolithographic technologies, when a minimum width is approximately 0.13 microns, the spacing is at least approximately 0.5 microns, i.e., the spacing of the link portion from the end portions is at least twice the minimum width.

Further, Claim 1 sets forth that the two minimum design width end portions and the sub-minimum width link portion are produced simultaneously in one photolithographic operation, and an application of said first and second power supply voltages across said end portions causes an electrical property of said fuse element to undergo a detectable change.

Claim 1 is being further amended to set forth the limitation of canceled Claim 7, i.e., that the spacing between said center portion and the end portions is sufficient to prevent the end portions from serving as a heat sink to increase the mount of joule heating required to change the electrical property.

Applicants submit that the rejection is now overcome and respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph.

For reasons submitted in applicants prior response dated November 13, 2003, Claim 1 is patentably distinct from the cited Delpech reference as Delpech clearly does not teach or suggest the fuse structure now set forth in amended Claim 1.

Claims 2-3 and 10-12, which depend directly or indirectly from the independent claim 1 incorporate all of the limitations of claim 1 and are therefore now in condition for allowance for at least those reasons provided for claim 1.

This application is now believed to be in condition for allowance, and a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference might expedite prosecution of this case, it is respectfully requested that he call applicant's attorney at (516) 742-4343.

Respectfully submitted,



Steven Fischman
Registration No. 34,594

SCULLY, SCOTT, MURPHY & PRESSER
400 Garden City Plaza, Suite 300
Garden City, New York 11530
(516) 742-4343

SF:gc